

Appl. No. 10/787,342  
Docket No. AA615M  
Amdt. Dated July 6, 2009  
Reply to Office Action mailed on May 5, 2009  
Customer No. 27752

## REMARKS

### Claim Status

Claims 2 and 11 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Claim 11 has been amended to include the language of canceled claim 3.

Claims 1, 3-10 and 12 have been cancelled.

### Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over US 6,114,298 (Petri et al.) and in view of US 6,612,468 to Pritchett et al.

Claims 2 and 11 are been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,114,298 to Petri et al. (“Petri”) and in view of 6,612,468 to Pritchett et al. (“Pritchett”). Specifically, Col. 16, lines 23-44 of Petri et al. is cited for discussing a spray dispenser, preferably a trigger spray dispenser or in a pump spray dispenser, and may include manually operated foam trigger-type dispensers. In response to Applicants’ previous arguments of October 16, 2007, the Office Action asserted that Petri et al. teaches manually operated foam trigger-type dispensers which, at least, comprises a sprayer, which it concludes reads on Applicants’ claims. Further, the Office Action asserts that Pritchett specifically teaches the types of dispensers of Applicants’ claims, and therefore renders Applicants’ claims obvious upon combination with Petri. Applicants traverse the present rejection based upon the following comments.

As currently amended, Applicants’ claims require a shaped applicator. The shaped applicator was originally the limitation of currently canceled claim 3, but is not addressed in the present Office Action. Applicants teach that, “It has further been discovered that a shaped applicator can surprisingly provide significantly improved results and ease of use as compared to a normal applicator.” *See Applicants’ written description* at page 11, lines 30 and 31. Nothing in Petri or Pritchett teach or suggest the employment of a shaped applicator. Therefore, Applicants’ claims are unobvious over Petri or its combination with Pritchett.

Appl. No. 10/787,342  
Docket No. AA615M  
Amdt. Dated July 6, 2009  
Reply to Office Action mailed on May 5, 2009  
Customer No. 27752

Conclusion

This response represents an earnest effort to place the present application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as claimed from the applied reference(s). In view of the foregoing, entry of the amendment(s) presented herein, reconsideration of this application, and allowance of the pending claim(s) are respectfully requested. Applicants' attorney invites the Examiner to contact her with any questions she may have regarding the above referenced case.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By /idris mckelvey/

Idris N. McKelvey

Registration No. 57,057

(513) 983-2309

Date: July 6, 2009  
Customer No. 27752